Dear Jim, 8/6/76

I had hardly sealed the letter in which I address yesterday's mailing from the Archives on records of declassification when I remember an important proof I'd forgotten. From the past I was sure it was a truth but the doc's they had to give me prove it.

In every case the initial Archives letter was drafted by Johnson. It is not only that he did some entirely on his own, as with those handwritten ones. Where he drafted lettrs for others the internal distribution of carbons is indicated and he appears on each not only for distribution but clearly as author.

I do not mean this to imply that he is autonomous. I do think, in fairness to him, that he may well have initiated some of the efforts for various reasons. I also believe that he does these things under orders. But he drafts the original letters and in these cases they went out as he drafted them. He is also given as the person to whom to respond, with two different extensions given.

I told you of dozing off. I had barely done this when the phone rang. Some local person unknown to me was listening to the Jerry Williams show with Mark. It was a promo for Mark as the lone assassin of the lone assassin officialdom. I did tune WBZ, the Jerry Williams show, Reception was poor so I missed some until I could no longer stay awake. I have a separate radio in the bedroom with a pillow speaker so that with the volume low Lil is spared. I could not stay awake much.

The sickest part is where Williams would chide a listener for conjecturing because Lane deals with fact only and then Lane would respond with conjecture and non-fact.

Whichever of two interpretations fits, Lane is sick. Either he hasn't read what he rips off of my work or he is incapable of understanding and/or repeating it. The 1/22 and 1/27 transcripts are prime examples. Explicit as they are he can't even represent them accurately. And, of course, no mention of how this came out or even where listeners could get copies. If there were such calls from listeners, while I was awake they were screened out.

That not new Ruby as informant business, where the only proofs are that Ruby kidded the FBI and was never a squealer? That came out as "Ruby worked for the FBI." Even Lane's representation that this had never been used before is false. Peter Dale Scott and I have both used it in public. (Privately I took a different approach with it just before I spoke at Stevens Point and it may have given me a different approach when there is time for the back burner to turn on.)

Lane said he was there to organize a Mass. CCI beginning today.

My work on the Oswald Shirt and Lovelady's? That's Lane's, explicitly. He said.

Repugnant as these permeating dishonesties are, whether they come from ego or sickness of baser motive, my point is not complaint. There is disaster ahead from them for those associated with him, esp. the Congresspeople. And fairly obviously, they deny people access to the misrepresented information that, were it fairly represented could not be fully given to them by broadcast.

While writing this I've been tuning between the three network TV "news" a.m. shows. Kunstler was very effective on ABC. The one observer lawyer he noted as today present as a Little case judge-watcher is Phil Hirschkop, who had clerked for Kunstler. This reminds me of what Hirschkop told me the day before he went to Texas to take the Hunt case: he was taking it to make some money so he could afford to do the work he'd always done. Whether or not true, and he could be at the Little case as part of his own p.r., in fairness to Hirschkop I note my recollection. In the notes you have it was the day I saw Cohen, the Alexandria lawyer. Their offices were next to each other.

Best,